Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JUN 30 1992
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No. 91-1907

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

JAN. TERM, 1992

Patricia Rose Rabida,
PETITIONER

vs.

Joseph B. Van Orden, Jay Van Orden, Charles W. Mc Gowan III, Kent and Patricia Wardell, Stoye and Anna Milburn, Alfred O. and Betty Jane Knapp, Russell J. Knapp.
RESPONDENTS

NOTICE OF RELATED CASES

Patricia Rose Rabida
5425 Shoup Ave.
Woodland Hills Ca.
91367

(818)704-6772

Case No.CV 91-1770 RJK (TX) was filed in the Federal Court on April 2, 1991 during the two year delay in the State Court of Appeal's Opinion in No: 5 Civil Fol2692 relating to Sup. Ct. No.148 546.

CV 91-1770 RJK (TX) is a 353 page comprehensive document containing 143 exhibits labeled "A" to "M 6".

This case cites 41 causes of action relating directly to case No. 148 546, giving concrete facts which led to a 21 year controversy culminating in a 14 year litigation, and (according to court reporter Ron Horlacker in 1982) "the biggest file up here".

This case alledges, inter alia, that each and every attorney representing the respondents herein and/or Robert C. Monroe, were in the land business with their clients. Furthermore, each and every attorney representing the Petitioner

herein, except her trial attorney, litigated against their client's interest with willfullness, forcing her to litigate her own case "in the eleventh hour." The Causes of Action are:

I. GEOGRAPHICAL PROXIMITY OF ORIGINAL GROUP.

II. COMMON LONG TERM ASSOCIATIONS.

III. EARLY ACTIVITIES IN KERN COUNTY.

IV. NUMEROUS ESCROWS AND BANKING TRANSACTIONS BY MONROE.

V. OTHER MEMBERS HAVE MANY TRANSACTIONS BUT FEW ESCROWS ETC.

VI. GROUP CONSIST OF ILLEGAL SUBDIVIDERS.

VII. FORGERY, PARTY TO FORGERY, MAIL FRAUD, DECEIT AND CONSPIRACY IN LAND CONVEYANCES BY GROUP MEMBERS, ESCROW OFFICER AND NOTARY PUBLICS----.

VIII. GROUP EXCHANGED LAND WITH BULLDOZER OPERATOR,SALESMAN IN SUBDIVISION, NOTARIES TO DOCUMENTS OF CONVEYANCES, BANKING OFFICIALS AND THEIR FAMILIES.

IX. OTHER ASSOCIATIONS IN KERN COUNTY LAND BY THE GROUP.

X. GROUP MEMBERS OPERATED WITHOUT LICENSES.

XI. INVASION OF PRIVACY ON PETITIONER'S LAND & PETITIONER ACCOUSTED BY LEATHAL WEAPON.

XII. INVASION OF PRIVACY IN PETITIONER'S HOME.

XIII. USE OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS TO HARASS PETITIONER IN HER HOME AND ON HER LAND.

XIV. PETITIONER HARASSED AT HER NEW RESIDENCE. (AFTER FLEEING HER HOME)

XV. DEFENDANTS HEREIN CONSPIRE WITH CONTRACTOR AND HIS EMPLOYEE FOLLOWING EXTENSIVE DAMAGE TO PETITIONER'S HOME.

XVI. PETITIONER HARASSED BY FRAUDULANT CLAIMS & CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT MAIL FRAUD VIA U.S. MAIL.

XVII. PETITIONER WAS SEVERELY DAMAGED ----.

PART II

XVIII. AUTHOR OF COMPLAINT IS A MEMBER OF THE GROUP.

XIX. PETITIONER'S ONE OF MANY CASES FILED.

XX. CONSPIRACY, PERJURY, SUBORDINATION TO PERJURY, FRAUD AND DECEIT RELATING TO COMPLAINT FILED IN CASE NO.148546.

XXI. PETITIONER'S ATTORNEY JOINS IN THE CONSPIRACY.

XXII. CONSPIRACY AND DECEIT BY (attorney) KERR, RE. INTERROGATORIES.

XXIII. MAPS AND ROADS IN THE S80 FROM 1969-1988.

XXIV. CONSPIRACY AND DECEIT AT DEPOSITIONS BY MONROE, VAN ORDEN, AND ATTORNEYS KERR, ROBERTS AND SHANE.

XXV. CONSPIRACY AND DECEIT BY VAN ORDEN, AND MC GOWAN IN DESCRIPTION OF PURPORTED PRIOR EXISTING ROAD IN "S80".

XXVI. CONSPIRACY, DECEIT REGARDING THE NUMBER OF ACRES INVOLVED.

XXVII. JUDGE JERALD K. DAVIES JOINS IN THE CONSPIRACY.

XXVIII. ATTORNEY WILLIAM PALMER AND JUDGE WILLIAM A. STONE JOIN THE CONSPIRACY.

XXIX.(ATTORNEYS) PALMER AND SHANE CONSPIRE TO RELEASE MONROE AND MAIL FRAUD.

XXX.TRIAL JUDGE JOHN M. STANTON JOINS THE CONSPIRACY.

XXXI.JUDGEMENT IN CASE #148546 VIOLATES THE FUNDAMENTAL INGREDIENT OF PROCE-DUE PROCESS U.S.C.A. CONST.AMENDS. 5 & 14 IN THAT THE ADJUDICATOR WAS VERY PARTIAL AND HAS INFECTED THE TRIAL WITH FUNDAMENTAL, FLAGRANT UNFAIRNESS WHICH ,MORE THAN LIKELY, CHANGED THE OUTCOME OF THESE HEARINGS.

PART THREE

XXXII.APPEALS ATTORNEY, SYLVIA T. WHITMORE JOINS IN THE CONSIRACY.

XXXIII. APPEALS ATTORNEY,STUART ZIMRING ET AL JOINS IN THE CONSPIRACY.

XXXIV.JUDGE ROBERTT BACA AND ATTORNEY ROBERT P. MC NAMEE JOIN IN THE CONSPIRACY.

XXXV. CONSPIRACY CONTINUED THROUGH REMAND HEARING BY JUDGE JOHN M. NAIRN, VAN

ORDEN AND ATTORNEY HARRY M. REYNOLDS.

XXXVI.JUDGEMENT IN CASE NO. 143 612 VN VIOLATES THE FUNDAMENTAL INGRDIENT OF PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS U.S.C.A. CONST. AMENDS. 5 & 14 IN THAT THE ADJUDICATOR WAS VERY PARTIAL AND HAS INFECTED TRIAL WITH A FUNDAMENTAL AND FLAGRANT UNFAIRNESS WHICH MORE THAN LIKELY CHANGED THE OUTCOME OF HEARINGS.

XXXVII.CONSPIRACY TO DELETE THE AUG. 1970 MAP AND GRANTOR'S TRANSMITTAL LETTER FROM THE RECORD.

XXXVIII.CONSPIRACY TO FALSIFY THE RECORD JUDGE NUNLEY, AND (ATTRORNEYS) AUSTIN C. SMITH, SYLVIA WHITMORE AND (COURT REPORTER) LA GRETTA REYNOLDS.

XXXIX.EVIDENCE THAT REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPTS WERE CONTRIVED.

XXXX. ATTORNEY CARL LINDSTROM JOINS IN THE CONSPIRACY BY AIDING AND ABETTING WHITMORE'S ATTORNEYS.

XXXXI. COMMON DESIGN AND SCHEME UNDERLYING WITHIN CAUSES OF ACTION.

XXXXII.ON ALL CAUSES OF ACTIONS INVOLVING ATTORNEYS; SUBORDINATION TO PERJURY, MALPRACTICE, NEGLIGENCE, CONSPIRACY TO OBSTRUCT JUSTICE, ABUSE OF PROCESS, IMPEDIMENT OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS TO DUE PROCESS AND SPEEDY TRIAL.

XXXXIII.JUDGES,DAVIS, STANTON, BACA, NAIRN AND NUNLY ARE GUILTY OF MISCONDUCT IN OFFICE, ABUSE OF PROCESS, IMPEDIMENT TO A PARTY'S CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO DUE PROCESS AND A SPEEDY TRIAL.

NOTE; Cross-Complaint No.143 612 VN by petitioner Patricia Rose Rabida was incorporated by reference into Case No. CV 91-1770 RJK (TX).

No. 143612 Sylvia T Whitmore (See XXXII at pg. 5 supra) sued for $13,000.00 in attorney's fees. Stuart Zimering filed a Cross-Complaint which Petitioner attempted to have amended

Present status: Judge declared Mistrial which was then changed to "Non-suit".

Related Case: Case No. 695302

This case relates to Robert Stroughter Sr. who was instrumental in attorney Robert P. Mc Namee being retained in case No. 148546.

Robert P. Mc Namee was immediately taken off the case for conspiring with attorney Harry M. Reynolds against his own client. He was named as a defendant in case CV 91-1770 RJK (TX). He had closed his office and could not be located to be served. According to the local Bar Association, Mc Namee has been silenced.

Robert Straughter was paid $2,000.00 to locate honest attorneys and review their performance at initial hearings in case # 148 546 and 143 612 VN. Stroughter also also contracted for a loan of $5,000.00 to be paid off in 3 months.

Case was filed Dec. 5, 1989.

Cancelled checks were presented to the court evidencing said arrangements.

Present status: Judge Reed Ambler is working deligently to have the case dismissed although he has not stated the grounds underlying his intent to dismiss.

I, Patricia Rose Rabida have accused Judge Read Ambler of siding against me to protect fellow judges (in Kern).
It is possible that Hon. Peter Stone of San Jose Superior Court is related to Hon. William A Stone of Kern County but I have not been able to find out.
Re. Related Case No.PC003197:
This case arose out of my employment by San Fernando Hospital, wherein I filed for Breach of Contract, Loss of Wages , Emotional Harm and Deceit. filed on March 15, 1991.
Because of concurrent cases I asked a newly admitted to the bar, to represent me on this case as well as the above

(Straughter) Case. I told her that the opposition had not yet filed an answer therefore I needed a Default Judgment filed, and in the Straughter case I needed a Summary Judgment and/or Answer Insufficient to Constitute a Defense to be filed. Attorney Candice Blaz set up an appointment to review the files. It turned out that she was sharing offic quarters with Sylvia T. Whitmore (See XXXII at page 5 herein) Attorney Blaz telephoned me to say that it didn't matter that an aswer hadn't been filed. She said that I had to wait and see how long they waited to file their answer. Next thing I knew they filed an answer, I filed for a default judgment wherein the court deemed that the law allowed them a 10 day extension. Since then this case has also gone from bad to worse So far each rule of court has been bent to accommodate my opposition.

BEST AVAIL

It is to be noted that my means of making a living was a prime target in the original 148 546 case. (See XII-XV at page 3 herein)

Prior to case 148 546 I had no trouble whatsoever with employment. At the time 148 546 was filed I was a supervisor in a large reference laboratory. Since that case was filed I have had to look outside my profession because when I did get hired I was "let go" under strange and unussual circunstances. (As in this case)

Conclusion:

The above cases are interdependent with each one enhancement to the others. As such the ends of justice would best be served by all cases being presented to the same tribunal in the order in which they arose.

Dated: June 24, 1992

Respectfully Submitted Patricia Rabida

Patricia Rabida
in Pro Per

BLE COPY

T29S R33E S2 OF SE4 SEC. 11

Photo. Date:4-25-70



T29S R33E S2 OF SE4 SEC. 11

Photo. Date:4-25-70



T29S R33E S2 OF SE4 SEC. 11

Photo. Date:7-2-70

T29S R33E S2 OF SE4 SEC. 11

Photo. Date:7-19-75

T29S R33E S2 OF SE4 SEC. 11

Photo. Date:5-7-81

T29S R33E S2 OF SE4 SEC. 11

Photo. Date:9-3-83



T29S R33E S2 OF SE4 SEC. 11

Photo. Date:9-6-89